

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 1-6, 19-21 and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boloker in view of Gbadegesin. Among other differences, the Boloker reference utilizes a static proxy address for its multi-modal shell as shown in FIG. 24 and also refers to a multi-modal communication as one that “provides a mechanism for parallel use of multiple access channels whereby transactions are shared across different devices.” Paragraph 78 states one channel handles, for example, voice communications of a video teleconference while another channel handles the video. In contrast, Applicant refers to multi-modal communication as one in which a request is made in one mode such as a text mode, and the reply information corresponding to the request is provided in a different mode, such as a voice mode (see Application page 5, lines 5-14; page 3, lines 4-8 and elsewhere). Boloker is directed to a different apparatus and communication system.

Moreover, claim 1 requires, for example, the use of a plurality of multi-modal session proxy servers each having a proxy address and a controller that determines, on a per session basis, which of the plurality of multi-modal proxy identifier represents a proxy address of a selected multi-modal session proxy server of the plurality of proxy servers. As noted above, the Boloker reference suffers from the same problems as noted in Applicant’s Background of the Invention section since it employs a single multi-modal shell with a static IP address. There is no mention in the cited portions of Boloker as to any other different operation. Such systems would require a user to provide an information fetch request through the same static multi-modal proxy. The Gbadegesin reference is directed to an intelligent transparent application gateway between a private and public network that binds a proxy application to a local socket, uses the proxy application to command a generalized network address translator to generate a dynamic port redirect from a destination port number to the local socket and receives from the address translator, a request from a client to

connect to a destination port number and then redirects the request of the local socket and then services the request. As such, the Gbadegesin reference is directed to a redirection technique and again describes a single proxy and no multi-modal communication is contemplated. In addition, the claim requires a plurality of multi-modal session proxy servers and a controller that determines on a per session basis which of the plurality of multi-modal proxy identifiers represent the proxy address of the selected multi-modal session proxy server. The office action cited column 7. However, again this cited portion is silent as to multiple multi-modal proxy servers and per session based selection of one of a plurality of the multi-modal proxy servers. Instead, the Gbadegesin reference teaches to translate one network session into another using a single proxy (see column 7, lines 13-15). The Gbadegesin reference is not directed to a multi-modal system of the type claimed nor is it directed to a multi-proxy server system as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim is in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 19, the claim requires, among other things, evaluating, on a per session basis, a browser proxy identifier in response to receiving the multi-modal proxy identifier and sending an information request using a first mode via a multi-modal session proxy server identified by the multi-modal proxy identifier and receiving a reply to the request in a second mode using the same proxy server. The cited references do not teach the multi-modal proxy server configuration as claimed. In addition, the references do not describe a multi-proxy selection of a plurality of multi-modal proxy servers. Other differences will be recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art.

As to claim 26, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 and as such, this claim is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-29-07

By: C. Reckamp  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 North LaSalle  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1003  
312/609-7500  
312/609-5005 Facsimile